

¹ i was forbidden from access to data on (b) (5), (b) (6)

² do not feel comfortable reporting here

³ My reports were altered

⁴ This survey is getting a little long...

⁵

I personally was not subjected to any of the above, but observed policy decision-makers completely ignoring sound scientific conclusions.

⁶ rulemaking rationale

⁷ everything

⁸

HQ would not support regional positions and recommendations on environmental impacts. HQ would not support elevation of issues to HQ.

⁹ Written mid/end of year (b) (6) reviews

¹⁰ do not ask about (b) (5)

¹¹ As already explained, the problem was a lack of reliance on EPA expertise by political appointees.

¹² Very carefully worded presentations and planning documents in order to not "trigger"

¹³ it is a lot easier to ignore rather than alter DSOs

¹⁴ A rulemaking that is supposed to be based on science, but political appointees said what was to be written.

¹⁵ There was the general prohibition from using the (b) (5)

16 (b) (6), (b) (5)

17 in one case, a scientific opinion on a policy document was not responded to.

18 (b) (5)

19 (b) (5), (b) (6)

20 (b) (6)

21 Some pressure to caveat findings.

22 (b) (5)

23 This is not exactly misrepresentation but not allowing staff to perform their job/tasks using the best methods and procedures to speed up investigations. Not altered data but not what was needed to meet project objectives.

24 Somewhat disingenuous, as to release conclusions requires review/approval

25 (b) (5), (b) (6)

26 (b) (5)

27 (b) (5), (b) (6)

This is a subtle and fairly minor change.

28 (b) (5), (b) (6)

²⁹ Attempts were made to minimize technical positions not in favor by prior administration.

³⁰ interpreting the peer review handbook

³¹ (b) (5), (b) (6)

³² The (b) (6) was routinely ignored and decisions were made by political leaders

³³ (b) (5)

³⁴ none

³⁵ no basis to answer these questions

³⁶ I wasn't pressured, I was just told there was no problem and left to do what I needed to do.

³⁷ Asked to justify a preferred action using existing data

³⁸ could not refer to (b) (5) or other scientific conclusions in documents

³⁹ Development of agency guidance / policy clarification

⁴⁰ This survey is too long. I don't have time for all of this. We need more staff so we aren't overwhelmed with work.

⁴¹ (b) (5), (b) (6)

(unclear whether workload, policy, or other reasons)

⁴² No misrepresent or alter. But everything was limited or delayed.

⁴³ we had to limit our discussion about (b) (5)

⁴⁴ program information

⁴⁵ We obviously could not include any topics discussing (b) (5) [REDACTED] and other regulations enacted during the Obama administration.

46 (b) (5)

47 None

⁴⁸ See previous comments; expression of personal view on how a matter can be described (not a scientific conclusion).

49 Although it was longer than two years ago. (b) (5), (b) (6)

50 (b) (5), (b) (6)

51 (b) (5)

⁵² We were not allowed to (b) (5), (b) (6)

⁵³ Preparation of updates to scientific product

54 For internal review of manuscripts and other science products, (b) (5), (b) (6)

██████████ This manuscript would then be submitted to the political leaders for their review and approvals.

55 (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] but my management has mostly supported my
assertions that this is not scientifically supported.

56 (b) (5), (b) (6) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

57 (b) (5) [REDACTED]

58 Agency decision documents

59 but we persevered

60 Aforementioned change in office responsible for the project

61 level playing field policy warps all of the above. emerging technologies are
all "no"

62 (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

63
I feel like it is too strong a statement to say that I experienced pressure to
misrepresent or alter data, but there are times where there is pressure to
(b) (5) [REDACTED].

64 Present information clear for audience.

65 No longer publish, too much retaliation

66 We were advised to omit (b) (5) [REDACTED]

67 (b) (5) [REDACTED]

68 (b) (5), (b) (6) [REDACTED]

69 research was blocked so all would be yes in a way

70

Prior to 2019, yes to some of these. But 2019-2020, it was more subtle.
The data would be accurately reported but policy calls based on the data
would be counter to staff opinions of where the data was leading.

71 Overreliance of anecdotal evidence

72 Scientific conclusions in press communications

73

Not sure about all of these, but I have been asked to change things, but at
the word of an author or scientist, sometimes after STICs review.

74 (b) (5), (b) (6)

75 The concept that a scientific decision can be made with an absence of
actual data.

76 Why limit to 2 years we are talking about culture.

77 An important decision was made for political reason and not by looking at
the facts yes.

78 (b) (5)

79 (b) (5)

80 I do not have no findings

81 (b) (5)

- specifically time is necessary to determine sampling
methodology to ensure good data outcomes

82 None

83 (b) (5), (b) (6)

84

2 others here: (b) (5)

(b) (5) 2) with
the new administration, my head spun with the opposite where we were
ENCOURAGED to talk about all of the above (by the way I consider #2 a
good thing and wanted to capture that somewhere)

85

Not specifically, but there were occasions when (b) (5)

86 was told to remove (b) (5)

87 not pressured... conclusions were just sitting on a halt

88

(b) (5)
89 (b) (5)
90 (b) (5), (b) (6)
91 (b) (5), (b) (6)